

REMARKS

Claims 2-7 and 11-15 were pending. Claims 2, 7, 11, 14 and 15 have been amended. Accordingly, claims 2-7 and 11-15 remain pending.

Generally speaking, the present Office Action maintains the rejections made in the previous Office Action. In particular, claims 2, 11 and 14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Edberg, et al. (U.S. Patent 5,682,158); claims 3, 7, 12, 13 and 15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Edberg, et al. in view of Calhoun (U.S. Patent 5,819,303) and further in view of Tsuchimura (U.S. Patent 5,799,303); claim 4 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Edberg in view of Calhoun, and finally claims 5 and 6 stand rejected as being unpatentable over Edberg in view of Chou (U.S. Patent 5,583,761).

In Applicant's previous amendment and response, Applicant provided comments regarding the meaning of certain claim terms and pointed out that such features are not taught or suggested by the cited art. For example, Applicant noted that "locale refers to a language table of an internationalized application." In the present Office Action (paragraph 2), the examiner cited Webster's New World Dictionary (1995) for a different definition of the term "locale". In particular, the Dictionary is cited as defining the term "locale" as "a locality, which is a place or district (nation) (page 346)."

While claim terms may generally be given their plain meaning, it is well established that an Applicant may be his or her own lexicographer. In particular, where an explicit definition is provided by the applicant for a term, that definition will control interpretation of the term as it is used in the claim. *Toro Co. v. White Consolidated Industries Inc.*, 199 F.3d 1295, 1301, 53 USPQ2d 1065, 1069 (Fed. Cir. 1999). In the present case, a definition for the term "locale" is found in the description as follows:

"The term "locale" will be utilized to refer to the language table component of an internationalized application." (Description, page 6, lines 1-3).

In view of the above, Applicant submits recourse to a Dictionary for a definition of the term "locale" in the present case is not necessary or appropriate.

In addition to the above, the examiner further objects (paragraph 2) that the Applicant made arguments which are directed to certain features which do not appear in the claims. While Applicant submits at least some of those features are included in the definition of the term "locale" above, and Applicant accordingly traverses the rejections, Applicant has amended the claims to explicitly recite such features which are neither taught nor suggested by the cited art. For example, each of the independent claims has been amended to recite the following:

"wherein the multibyte binary words comprise a multibyte locale for the single byte language, wherein said multibyte locale:

comprises a language table of an internationalized application which binds to the application at run time;

comprises language-specific processing information and conventions specific to a particular locale; and

requires that each character be represented by more than one byte."

Accordingly, the objection to reading limitations from the specification into the claims is overcome. Further, as discussed in Applicant's previous amendment and response with respect to these features (Applicant's remarks from the previous amendment and response are incorporated herein by reference), the cited art neither teaches nor suggests all of the features of the independent claims.

Applicant believes the application is now in condition for allowance. However, should the examiner believe there remain issues which would prevent the application from proceeding to allowance, the below signed representative would appreciate, and requests, a telephone interview in order to facilitate a resolution. The below signed representative can be reached at (512) 853-8866.

CONCLUSION

Applicant submits the application is in condition for allowance, and an early notice to that effect is requested.

If any fees are due, the Commissioner is authorized to charge said fees to Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin, Kowert, & Goetzel, P.C. Deposit Account No. 501505/5681-82401/RDR.

Also enclosed herewith are the following items:

☒ Return Receipt Postcard

Respectfully submitted,



Rory D. Rankin
Reg. No. 47,884
ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANT(S)

Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin,
Kowert, & Goetzel, P.C.
P.O. Box 398
Austin, TX 78767-0398
Phone: (512) 853-8800

Date: May 20, 2005